



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,106	04/02/2004	Andreas J. Heix	34874-097 UTIL	2886
64280	7590	07/30/2007		
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. 9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE SUITE 600 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			EXAMINER SAEED, USMAAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/30/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/817,106	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HEIX ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Usmaan Saeed	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 5/14/2007 is acknowledged. Claims 1, 15, and 20 have been amended.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. In view of the amendments received on 05/14/2007, the 35 U.S.C 101 rejections regarding tangible results are hereby withdrawn.

Claims 20-23 remain rejected because they recite machine readable medium. Applicant's description includes both tangible mediums (e.g. magnetic discs, optical disks, memory) and non-tangible mediums (e.g. signals) as their machine readable medium. Appropriate correction is required.

***Specification***

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 20 recites "tangible", which is not present in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2166

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9, 13-17, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Giles J. Burgess**. (**Burgess** hereinafter) (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0033286) in view of **Dinh et al.** (**Dinh** hereinafter) (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0195970).

With respect to claim 1, **Burgess** teaches a **machine-implemented method comprising:**

**“receiving input corresponding to a displayname of a data resource”** as an arbitrary-length stream of data 212 defined by the file contents 210 is processed through a message digest module 214 to generate a message digest 216 (**Burgess** Paragraph 0034).

**“preparing a resource identifier of the data resource within a repository based on the input and naming conventions associated with the repository”** as the message digest 216 is a fixed-length binary number which is further processed through a text encoder module 218 to generate a CSFN 220 (**Burgess** Paragraph 0034 & paragraph 0040).

**“preparing the displayname of the data resource based on the input”** as the term "file reference" is intended to more broadly describe any information that specifies a particular file; possibly by specifying a device and path in addition to a filename, for access. Thus, a "file reference" may contain a "filename" (**Burgess** Paragraph 0015).

**“storing the prepared displayname”** as (**Burgess** Figure 4 and 5).

**Burgess** teaches the elements of claims 1 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose **“the displayname being a name of the data resource to display to an end-user of an application instead of a resource identifier of the data resource”** and **“the resource identifier to identify the data resource within the repository rather than the displayname.”**

However, **Dinh** discloses **“the displayname being a name of the data resource to display to an end-user of an application instead of a resource identifier of the data resource”** as in some embodiments, the creating includes displaying to the user through the browser the available resource list, and receiving a user's chosen resource name from the available resource list displayed to the user, including resource security data for the chose resource name (**Dinh** Paragraph 0027).

**“the resource identifier to identify the data resource within the repository rather than the displayname”** as URIs identify named objects in namespaces, where the names may or may not resolve to addresses, while URLs do resolve to addresses. Although standards today are written on the basis of URIs, it is still common to see web-related identifiers, of the kind used to associate web data locations with network addresses for data communications, referred to as "URLs." In this specification, we refer to such identifiers generally as URIs (**Dinh** Paragraph 0047).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Dinh's** teachings would have allowed **Burgess** to provide efficient and secure system by providing mapping of resources to the user specific ID's with passwords and displaying the names of the resources.

With respect to claim 2, **Burgess** teaches **“wherein preparing the resource identifier comprises preparing the resource identifier such that the resource identifier resembles the displayname”** as the term "file reference" is intended to more broadly describe any information that specifies a particular file; possibly by specifying a device and path in addition to a filename, for access. Thus, a "file reference" may contain a "filename" (**Burgess** Paragraph 0015).

With respect to claim 3, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein preparing the displayname comprises modifying an existing displayname**” as (**Burgess** Figures 3-5).

With respect to claim 4, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein preparing the resource identifier comprises generating the data resource and the resource identifier in the repository**” as (**Burgess** Figure 3).

With respect to claim 5, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein preparing the displayname comprises setting a displayname property of the data resource if the repository supports display name properties**” as the term “file reference” is intended to more broadly describe any information that specifies a particular file; possibly by specifying a device and path in addition to a filename, for access (**Burgess** Paragraph 0015). Server 1 contains an HTML file named “File1.html” according to known naming conventions (**Burgess** Paragraph 0040).

With respect to claim 6, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein the displayname is a custom property of the data resource**” as the term “file reference” is intended to more broadly describe any information that specifies a particular file; possibly by specifying a device and path in addition to a filename, for access (**Burgess** Paragraph 0015).

With respect to claim 7, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein the data resource comprises a link, the method further comprising: determining if a target resource of the link has a displayname; and if the target resource has a displayname, presenting the displayname of the target resource as a proposed displayname, otherwise presenting the resource identifier of the target resource as a proposed displayname**” as with links to all of the files required for each and every feature of the software being installed. Such links may include file references that are location-specific and file references that contain CSFN's (**Burgess** Paragraph 0053).

With respect to claim 8, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein preparing the resource identifier comprises renaming the resource identifier based on the input**” as an arbitrary-length stream of data 212 defined by the file contents 210 is processed through a message digest module 214 to generate a message digest 216 (**Burgess** Paragraph 0034). The message digest 216 is a fixed-length binary number which is further processed through a text encoder module 218 to generate a CSFN 220 (**Burgess** Paragraph 0034 & paragraph 0040).

With respect to claim 9, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein preparing the resource identifier comprises including at least a portion of the displayname in the resource identifier**” the term “file reference” is intended to more broadly describe any information that specifies a particular file; possibly by specifying a device and path in



addition to a filename, for access. Thus, a "file reference" may contain a "filename" (Burgess Paragraph 0015).

With respect to claim 13, **Burgess** teaches **"wherein the naming conventions associated with the repository comprise a naming convention excluding duplicate resource identifiers in a resource region and preparing the resource identifier based on that naming convention comprises: modifying a proposed resource identifier if another data resource, in a same resource region as the data resource, has a second resource identifier that is identical to the proposed resource identifier"** as server 1 contains an HTML file named "File1.html" according to known naming conventions. Also stored on Server 1 are two graphic image files that are referenced in the HTML in "File1.html." These files are named, according to the invention, CSFN1 and CSFN2. They may contain, for example, graphic images of banner advertisements that are to appear on the web page defined by "File1.html." Those of ordinary skill will recognized that the notational form, "CSFNx" in this example, is used for simplicity. The actual filenames will be of the form "% % XXXXXX.ext" where "% %" is the CSFN-indicating prefix, "XXXXXX" is a character string generated according to the present invention and will vary greatly depending on file content. The extension ".ext" is a generic representation of a conventional extension used to denote a particular type of file, for example, ".jpg" for a well-known type of graphic image file (Burgess Paragraph 0040 and 0058).

With respect to claim 14, **Burgess** teaches “**wherein the naming conventions associated with the repository comprise a naming convention that retains content-type extensions in the resource identifier and preparing the resource identifier based on that naming convention comprises: including a content-type extension in the resource identifier regardless of the input**” as server 1 contains an HTML file named "File1.html" according to known naming conventions. Also stored on Server 1 are two graphic image files that are referenced in the HTML in "File1.html." These files are named, according to the invention, CSFN1 and CSFN2. They may contain, for example, graphic images of banner advertisements that are to appear on the web page defined by "File1.html." Those of ordinary skill will recognize that the notational form, "CSFNx" in this example, is used for simplicity. The actual filenames will be of the form "% % XXXXXX.ext" where "% %" is the CSFN-indicating prefix, "XXXXXX" is a character string generated according to the present invention and will vary greatly depending on file content. The extension ".ext" is a generic representation of a conventional extension used to denote a particular type of file, for example, ".jpg" for a well-known type of graphic image file (**Burgess** Paragraph 0040).

Group of claim 15-17, and 20-21 are essentially the same as group of claims 1-9 except they set forth the claimed invention as a system and an article and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

5. Claims 10-11, 18, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Giles J. Burgess**. (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0033286) in view of **Dinh et al.** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0195970) as applied to claims 1-9, 13-17, and 20-21 above, further in view of **Koppolu et al.** (**Koppolu** hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,099).

With respect to claim 10 and 11, **Burgess and Dinh** do not explicitly disclose “presenting the displayname to a user interface” and “wherein presenting the displayname comprises presenting the displayname to the user interface and excluding the resource identifier from being presented to the user interface.”

However, **Koppolu** discloses “presenting the displayname to a user interface” and “wherein presenting the displayname comprises presenting the displayname to the user interface and excluding the resource identifier from being presented to the user interface” as the GetDisplayName function returns a human-readable display name of the object 80 which the client can display to the user, such as in a list box control or other user interface element. The display name is a text string that names the object 80, such as a path and file name or an Internet URL. The ParseDisplayName function operates in reverse, creating a moniker based on a text string provided by the client (**Koppolu** Col 12, Lines 27-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Koppolu’s** teachings would have allowed **Burgess and Dinh** to asynchronously bind or retrieve data referenced by a name without blocking execution of the client. This allows

the client to provide responsive user interaction including when remotely retrieving data  
(**Koppolu** Abstract).

Claim 18 and 22 are essentially the same as claims 10-11 except they set forth the claimed invention as a system and an article and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

6. Claims 12, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Giles J. Burgess**. (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0033286) in view of **Dinh et al.** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0195970) as applied to claims 1-9, 13-17, and 20-21 above, further in view of **Daniel G. Pouzzner**. (**Daniel** hereinafter) (U.S. PG Pub No. 2004/0044791).

With respect to claim 12, **Burgess** teaches “wherein the naming conventions associated with the repository comprise a naming convention” and “preparing the resource identifier based on that naming convention” as the message digest 216 is a fixed-length binary number which is further processed through a text encoder module 218 to generate a CSFN 220 (**Burgess** Paragraph 0034 & paragraph 0040).

**Burgess** teaches the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose “one set of characters to be excluded from the resource identifier” and “if a proposed resource identifier has a set of character to be excluded from the resource identifier, mapping the set of characters to one or more characters that can be included in the resource identifier.”

However, **Daniel** discloses “one set of characters to be excluded from the resource identifier” and “if a proposed resource identifier has a set of character to be excluded from the resource identifier, mapping the set of characters to one or more characters that can be included in the resource identifier” as steps include excluding characters that are prohibited from appearing in internationalized host names, changing all characters with case properties to be lowercase, and then normalizing the characters (**Daniel** Paragraph 0117, 0064, 0083).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Daniel's** teachings would have allowed **Burgess and Dinh** to allows the most common and computationally fastest encodings to be placed earlier in the iterative rotation so as to maximize efficiency for mapping characters (**Daniel** Paragraph 0230).

Claim 19 and 23 are essentially the same as claims 12-14 except they set forth the claimed invention as a system and an article and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/14/2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

See above rejections for the arguments. In these arguments applicant relies on the amended claims and not the original ones.

Claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation during examination and limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim (See M.P.E.P. 2111 [R-I]).

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


**Contact Information**

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usmaan Saeed whose telephone number is (571)272-4046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Usmaan Saeed  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2166

Leslie Wong   
Primary Examiner

US  
July 11, 2007

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER